اِنَّ هٰذَا الْقُرْاٰنَ يَهْدِيْ لِلَّتِيْ هِيَ اَقْوَمُ وَيُبَشِّرُ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ الَّذِيْنَ يَعْمَلُوْنَ الصّٰلِحٰتِ اَنَّ لَهُمْ اَجْرًا كَبِيْرًا

Quran English Translation and Tafseer

Sayyid Abul Ala Mawdudi

Surah 58 – Al-Mujadilah (The Pleading Woman)

سُوْرَةُ الْمُجَادِلَةِ مَدَنِيَّةٌ

بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِيْمِ

(In the name of Allah, the Merciful, the Compassionate)

قَدْ سَمِعَ اللّٰهُ قَوْلَ الَّتِيْ تُجَادِلُكَ فِيْ زَوْجِهَا وَتَشْتَكِيْٓ اِلَى اللّٰهِ ۖ وَاللّٰهُ يَسْمَعُ تَحَاوُرَكُمَا ۭ اِنَّ اللّٰهَ سَمِيْعٌۢ بَصِيْرٌ ۝١

(58:1) Allah [1] has surely heard the words of her who contends with you concerning her husband and complains to Allah. Allah hears what both of you say. [2] Verily Allah is All-Hearing, All-Seeing.

(1) Here, hearing does not merely imply hearing a complaint but also redressing the grievances.

(2) The translators generally have translated these sentences in the past tense, which tends to give the meaning that the woman had left after relating her complaint and the Prophet (peace be upon him) sometime later might have received this revelation. That is why Allah has said: We indeed heard what the woman said, who was pleading with you and complaining to Us, and We were at that time hearing the conversation of both of you. But in most of the traditions that have been reported in the Hadith about this incident, it has been stated that right at the time when the woman was relating the zihar pronounced by her husband and complaining to the Prophet (peace be upon him) to the effect that if she was separated from her husband, she and her children would be ruined, the state of receiving revelation appeared on the Prophet (peace be upon him) and these verses were sent down. On this basis we have preferred rendering these sentences in the present tense.

The woman concerning whom these verses were sent down was Khaulah bint-Thalabah of the Khazraj tribe, and her husband, Aus bin Samit Ansari, was brother of Ubadah bin Samit,

the chief of the Aus tribe. The story of the zihar upon her is related in detail below. What is worth mentioning here is that the incident of woman's complaint being heard by Allah Almighty and the coming down of the divine command immediately to redress her grievance was an event that earned her a place of honor and esteem among the companions. Ibn Abi Hatim and Baihaqi have related that once Umar was on his way out with some companions. On the way he came across a woman, who stopped him; he immediately stopped and listened to what she had to say patiently with his head bent down, and did not move till she had finished. One of the companions said: O commander of the faithful, you held back the Quraish chiefs for so long for the sake of this old woman! Umar said: Do you know who she is? She is Khaulah bint- Thalabah, the woman whose complaint was heard at the seventh heaven. By God, even if she had kept me standing till the night, I would have kept standing. I would only have excused myself at the prayer times. Ibn Abdul Barr has related in Al-Istiab this tradition from Qatadah: When Umar came across this lady, on the way, he greeted her. After answering his greeting, she said: O Umar, there was a time when I saw you at the Ukaz festival. Then you were called Umair. You tended goats with the shepherd's staff in your hand. Then, not very long after this, you began to be called Umar. Then a time came when the people began addressing you as commander of the faithful. So, fear Allah with regard to your subjects, and remember that the one who fears Allah's punishment, for him the stranger also is like a close kinsman, and the one who fears death, may well lose that very thing which he wants to save. At this Jarud Abdi, who was accompanying Umar, said: O woman, you have talked insolently to the commander of the faithful. Thereupon Umar said: Let her say whatever she has to say. Do you know who she is? She was heard at the seventh heaven. So, she deserves to be heard longer and with greater attention by Umar. Imam Bukhari has also related briefly a story resembling to this.

اَلَّذِيۡنَ يُظٰهِرُوۡنَ مِنۡكُمۡ مِّنۡ نِّسَآئِهِمۡ مَّا هُنَّ اُمَّهٰتِهِمۡ ؕ اِنۡ اُمَّهٰتُهُمۡ اِلَّا الّٰٓـِٔىۡ وَلَدۡنَهُمۡ ؕ وَ اِنَّهُمۡ لَيَقُوۡلُوۡنَ مُنۡكَرًا مِّنَ الۡقَوۡلِ وَزُوۡرًا ؕ وَ اِنَّ اللّٰهَ لَعَفُوٌّ غَفُوۡرٌ ۲

(58:2) Those among you who divorce their wives by declaring them to be their mothers, [3] such are not their mothers; none are their mothers except those who gave birth to them. [4] Indeed what they say is highly contemptible and false. [5] Verily Allah is Most Pardoning, Most Forgiving. [6]

(3) Among the Arabs it often so happened that during a family quarrel, the husband in the heat of the moment would say to his wife: Anti alayya ka-zahri ammi which literally means: You are for me as the back of my mother. But its real meaning is: To have sexual relations with you would be like having sexual relations with my mother. Such words are still uttered by the foolish people, who, as the result of a family quarrel, declare the wife to be like their mother, or sister, or daughter, and make her unlawful for themselves like the prohibited women. This is called zihar. Zahr in Arabic is metaphorically used for riding and mounting. Thus, the conveyance is called zahr, because man rides on its back. As this word was employed in order to make the wife unlawful, it was termed zihar. In the pre- Islamic days this was looked upon as tantamount to the pronouncement of divorce, even of greater effect than that, for they took it to mean that the husband was not only severing his marital relations with his wife but was also declaring her to be unlawful for himself like his mother. On this very basis, the Arabs thought reunion could be possible after a divorce but it was impossible after zihar.

(4) This is Allah's first decision concerning zihar. It means that if a person shamelessly compares the wife to his mother, his this utterance does not make his wife his mother, nor is she endowed with the sanctity that the mother enjoys. The mother's being mother is fact, for she has given birth to the man. On this very ground, she is eternally sacred and prohibited. Now, how will the woman who has not given him birth become his mother simply by a word of mouth, and how will sanctity and prohibition be established for her by reason, morality and law which, by virtue of this fact, is only reserved for the mother who gave birth. Thus, Allah by this condemnation abolished the custom of the pre-Islamic ignorance according to which the marriage contract between the husband, by pronouncing zihar, and the wife stood

dissolved and she became absolutely forbidden for him like the mother.

(5) That is, to liken the wife to the mother is, in the first place, an absurd and shameful thing which no noble person should ever think of, not to speak of uttering it with the tongue. Secondly, it is also a falsehood, for if the one who says such a thing is giving the news that his wife has now become his mother for him, he is uttering falsehood, and if he is declaring that he has henceforth bestowed on his wife the sanctity of the mother, even then his claim is false, for God has not given him the authority that he may treat a woman as his wife as long as he likes and then start treating her as his mother as and when he likes. The lawgiver is Allah Almighty, not he, and Allah has included in the order of motherhood the grandmothers, both paternal and maternal, mother-in-law, foster mother and the wives of the Prophet (peace be upon him) along with the woman who gave birth. Nobody has the right to include of his own whim another woman in this order, not to speak of the woman who has been his wife. This gives the second legal injunction. To pronounce zihar is a grave sin and forbidden act, the violation of which deserves to be punished.

(6) That is, such an utterance actually deserves to be punished much more severely, but it is Allah’s kindness that He has, firstly, abolished the custom of ignorance and saved your family life from utter ruin, and secondly, has prescribed the lightest punishment for the culprits. And His supreme kindness is that the punishment too, is not any form of physical torture or imprisonment, but a few acts of worship and virtue, which are meant to reform you and help spread good in your society. In this connection, one should also understand that the acts of worship that have been prescribed by Islam as expiations for certain crimes and sins are neither mere punishments that they may be without the spirit of worship, nor mere acts of worship that they may entail no pain and suffering of the punishment. But both the aspects have been combined in them so that the culprit may experience pain as well as expiate his sin by means of performing a virtue and act of worship.

وَالَّذِيْنَ يُظٰهِرُوْنَ مِنْ نِّسَآئِهِمْ ثُمَّ يَعُوْدُوْنَ لِمَا قَالُوْا فَتَحْرِيْرُ رَقَبَةٍ مِّنْ قَبْلِ اَنْ يَّتَمَآسَّا ۭ ذٰلِكُمْ تُوْعَظُوْنَ بِهٖ ۭ وَاللّٰهُ بِمَا تَعْمَلُوْنَ خَبِيْرٌ ۝۳

(58:3) Those (7) who declare their wives to be their mothers and thereafter go back on what they have said (8) shall free a slave before they may touch each other. That is what you are exhorted to do. (9) Allah is fully aware of all your deeds. (10)

(7) From here begins the statement of the legal injunctions concerning zihar. To understand this, it is necessary that one should keep in mind the incidents of zihar that took place in the time of the Prophet (peace be upon him), for the code of law pertaining to zihar is derived from the verses and the judgments that the Prophet (peace be upon him) gave after the revelation of these verses in the cases of zihar brought before him.

According to Abdullah bin Abbas, the first case of zihar in Islam was the one relating to Aus bin Samit Ansari, on whose wife Khaulah's complaint Allah sent down these verse. Although the details of this case that the traditionists have cited from several reporters contain minor differences, yet the elements of legal import and significance are almost agreed upon. A resume of these traditions is as follows:

Aus bin Samit had grown a little peevish in old age and according to some traditions, had also developed an ailment resembling insanity. The reporters have described it by the word lamam which is not exactly madness in Arabic but a state resembling it. In this state he had also pronounced zihar on his wife several times before, but in Islam this was the first occasion that he pronounced it as the result of a quarrel with her. Thereupon, his wife appeared before the Prophet (peace be upon him) and relating the whole story to him, said: O Messenger of Allah, is there any way out of this situation that could save me and my children from ruin. The Prophet's (peace be upon him) reply has been reported in different words by different reporters. In some traditions the words are to the effect: No command has been given to me so far in this regard, and in some others the words are: In my opinion you have become unlawful to him, and

in still others: You are unlawful to him. At this, she began to cry and complain and told the Prophet (peace be upon him) over and over again that her husband had not pronounced the words of divorce; therefore, he should suggest a way by which she and her children and her old husband's life could be saved from ruin. But the Prophet (peace be upon him) gave her the same reply every time. In the meantime he underwent the state of receiving revelation and these verses were revealed. After this, he said to her (and according to other traditions, he called her husband and told him) to free a slave. When they expressed their inability to do so, he said that the husband would have to observe two months' fast consecutively. She said: Aus is such a man that unless he eats and drinks three times a day, his sight starts failing him. The Prophet (peace be upon him) said: Then, you will have to feed 60 poor people. They submitted that they did not have the means for that unless they were helped out by him. Thereupon the Prophet (peace be upon him) gave them food articles that could suffice 60 men for two meals. Different quantities of it have been mentioned in different traditions. According to some traditions Khaulah herself gave to her husband food articles equal in quantity to those given by the Prophet so that he may perform the expiation. (Ibn Jarir, Musnad Ahmad Abu Daud, Ibn Abi Hatim).

The second incident of zihar relates to Salamah bin Sakhr Bayadi. He had a somewhat abnormal appetite for sex. When the fasting month of Ramadan came, he, fearing that he might lose self-control in daytime in the state of fasting, pronounced zihar on his wife till the end of Ramadan. But he could not adhere to his pledge and went in to his wife one night. Penitent he appeared before the Prophet (peace be upon him) and told him what he had done. He told him to release a slave. He said he had no one else beside his wife, whom he could release. The Prophet (peace be upon him) then told him to observe two months' consecutive fast. He replied that it was during obligatory fasting itself that he had been unable to control himself and had become involved in trouble. The Prophet then said that he should feed 60 poor people, He replied that they were poor themselves and had gone to bed at night without food. Thereupon the Prophet (peace be upon him) got him a sufficient quantity of food articles from the

collector of the zakat of Bani Zurayq so that he may feed 60 persons and may also save something for his children. (Musnad Ahmad, Abu Daud, Tirmadhi).

The third incident that has been related without any reference to the name is that a man pronounced zihar on his wife and then had sexual intercourse with her even before making the expiation. Then, when he came to the Prophet (peace be upon him) to ask for the legal verdict, he commanded him to abstain from her till he had made the expiation. (Abu Daud, Tirmidhi, Nasai, Ibn Majah).

The fourth incident is that the Prophet (peace be upon him) himself heard a man calling his wife as sister. Thereupon he said to him angrily: Is she your sister. But he did not regard it as zihar. (Abu Daud). These four are the reliable incidents that have been related in the Hadith through authentic channels, and through them only can one adequately understand the Quranic injunctions that have been laid down in the following verses.

(8) Literally: That they return to that which they said, but in view of the Arabic language and idiom great differences have occurred in determining the meaning of these words.

Their one meaning can be: If they repeat the words of zihar after they have uttered them once. The Zahiriyyah and Bukair bin al-Ashajj and Yahya bin Ziyad al-Farm hold this very view, and a saying from Ata bin Abi Rabah also has been reported in support of the same. According to them, the pronouncement of zihar once is forgiven; however, if a person repeats it, he becomes liable to make the expiation. But this commentary is expressly wrong for two reasons: first, that Allah has condemned zihar as an absurd thing and a falsehood and then prescribed a penalty for it. Now, it is not conceivable that if a man utters falsehood or absurdities once he should be excused and if he utters it the second time he should make himself liable to punishment. The second reason of its being wrong is that the Prophet (peace be upon him) never asked the man pronouncing zihar whether he had pronounced it once or twice.

Its second meaning is: If the people who were used to uttering zihar in the pre-Islamic days of ignorance, repeat it in Islam, they will incur this punishment. This would mean that zihar should by itself be liable to punishment, and whoever utters the words of zihar for his wife, should become liable to make the expiation whether he may divorce the wife after it, or his wife may die; or he may have no intention of resuming conjugal relations with his wife. This view is hold by Taus, Mujahid, Shabi, Zuhri, Sufyan Thauri and Qatadah from among the jurists. They say that if the woman dies after the zihar, the husband cannot inherit her unless he has made the expiation.

The third meaning is: If after uttering the words of zihar the man may wish to go back on his words and make amends for what he said. In other words, yaudon lima qalo means that the man revoked what he had said.

The fourth meaning is: If the man may wish to make lawful what he had made unlawful for himself by pronouncing the zihar. In other words, it would mean that the person who had made a thing unlawful for himself has now returned to make it lawful views. Most of the jurists have preferred and adopted one of these last two.

(9) In other words: This you are being enjoined for your own correction and admonition so that the members of Muslim society may give up this evil custom of ignorance and none of you may commit this folly. If you have to quarrel with your wife, you may quarrel with her like good people. if you intend to divorce her, then you should divorce her gracefully. It is absurd that you should compare her to your mother and sister whenever you have a quarrel with her.

(10) That is, Allah will certainly know, even if nobody else does, if a person pronounces zihar, and then quietly resumes normal conjugal relations with his wife without first atoning for the offense. Such people cannot in any way escape Allah’s punishment.

فَمَنۡ لَّمۡ يَجِدۡ فَصِيَامُ شَهۡرَيۡنِ مُتَتَابِعَيۡنِ مِنۡ قَبۡلِ اَنۡ يَّتَمَآسَّا ؕ فَمَنۡ لَّمۡ يَسۡتَطِعۡ فَاِطۡعَامُ سِتِّيۡنَ مِسۡكِيۡنًا ؕ ذٰلِكَ لِتُؤۡمِنُوۡا بِاللّٰهِ وَ رَسُوۡلِهٖ ؕ وَ تِلۡكَ حُدُوۡدُ اللّٰهِ ؕ وَ لِلۡكٰفِرِيۡنَ عَذَابٌ اَلِيۡمٌ ۴

(58:4) And he who does not find a slave (to free), shall fast for two months consecutively before they may touch each other; and he who is unable to do so shall feed sixty needy people. (11) All this is in order that you may truly believe in Allah and His Messenger. (12) These are the bounds set by Allah; and a grievous chastisement awaits the unbelievers. (13)

(11) This is the divine commandment in respect of zihar. The following are the details of the law that the jurists of Islam have derived from the words of this verse, the judgments of the Messenger (peace be upon him) of Allah and the general principles of Islam.

(1) This law of zahir abrogates the Arabian custom of ignorance according to which the marriage contract stood annulled and the woman became permanently forbidden to the husband. Likewise, this law annuls all those laws and customs which regard zihar as a meaningless custom, which is of no legal effect, and permit man to continue having marital relations with his wife as usual even after having compared her to his mother and other prohibited relations. For in the sight of Islam the sanctity of the mother and other prohibited relations is not such an ordinary thing that a man may even think of the comparison between them and his wife, not to speak of uttering it with the tongue. Between the two extremes the position adopted by the Islamic law in this regard is based on three principles:

(a) That the marriage contract is not annulled by zihar, but the woman continues to be the husband’s wife as usual,

(b) that the woman becomes only temporarily prohibited to the man by zihar, and

(c) that this prohibition operates till the time that the husband makes the expiation, and that the expiation only can remove the prohibition.

(2) As for the person pronouncing zihar, it is agreed that the zihar of that husband is only reliable, who is of sound mind and mature age and pronounces the words of zihar in his right senses; the zihar of the child or of the insane person is not reliable. Moreover, the zihar of the person who might not be in his right senses at the time of pronouncing its words is also not reliable, e.g. if he mutters words during sleep, or is senseless, due to any reason. However, the jurists have differed on the following points:

(a) About the person who pronounces zihar in the state of intoxication. A great majority of them including the four Imams have given the verdict that since he has intentionally used the intoxicant, his zihar, like his divorce, will be regarded as valid legally, for he has undergone this state deliberately. However, if he has taken a medicine on account of illness and has been intoxicated, or has been compelled to take wine in intense thirst in order to save life, his zihar and divorce pronounced in that state will not be enforced. This very view is held by the Hanafis and the Shafeis and the Hanbalis and also the same was the view commonly held by the companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him). Contrary to it, Uthman held the view that the zihar and divorce pronounced in the state of intoxication are not reliable. Imam Tahawi and Karkhi from among the Hanafis hold this view as preferable and a statement of Imam Shafai also supports it. According to the Malikis the zihar pronounced in the state of intoxication will be reliable in case the person concerned has not wholly lost his senses, but talks sensibly and coherently and knows what he is saying.

(b) According to Imam Abu Hanifah and Imam Malik, only the zihar of the husband who is a Muslim is reliable. These injunctions do not apply to the non-Muslim subjects of the Islamic state, for the Quranic words: Alladhina yazahiruna minkum: those from among you who put away their wives by zihar, have been addressed to the Muslims, and the fasting, which is one of the three kinds of

the expiations prescribed in the Quran, obviously cannot be applicable to the non-Muslim subjects. According to Imam Shafei and Imam Ahmad, these injunctions will be applicable both to the Muslims and to the non-Muslims; however, there is no fasting for the non-Muslim subject: he may only free a slave or feed 60 poor.

(c) Can a woman also, like a man, pronounce zihar. For instance will it be zihar if she says to her husband: You are for me as my father, or I am for you like your mother. The four Imams say that this is not zihar and the legal injunctions of zihar do not apply to it at all. For the Quran in express words has laid down these injunctions in respect of the cases where the husbands pronounce zihar on their wives, and the authority to pronounce zihar can be held only by him who holds the authority to pronounce divorce. Just as the Shariah has not given the woman the power to divorce the husband, so it has also not given her the power to make her ownself unlawful to her husband. This same is the view of Sufyan Thauri, Ishaq bin Rahawaiyh, Abu Thaur and Laith bin Saad. They regard such a pronouncement by a woman as meaningless and without effect. Imam Abu Yusuf says that though this is not zihar, it will entail for the woman the atonement of the oath, for the pronouncement of such words by the woman means that she has sworn not to have marital relations with her husband. This same is the view of Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal as cited by Ibn Qadamah. Imam Auzai says that if before marriage the woman said that if she married a particular man he would be for her as her father, it would be zihar, and if she says such a thing after marriage it would be in the nature of an oath, which would entail the atonement for the oath. Contrary to it, Hasan Basri, Zuhri, Ibrahim Nakhai and Hasan bin Ziyad Lului say that this is zihar and will entail the expiation prescribed for zihar by the woman; however, the woman will not have the right to prevent the husband from coming in to her before making the expiation. Ibrahim Nakhai has cited this incident in support of this view. Musab, son of Zubair, sent a proposal of marriage to Aishah bint Talhah.

She turned down the proposal, saying: If I marred him, he would be for me as the back of my father (huwa alayya ka-zahri abi). After some time, she decided to marry him willingly. When the jurists of Al-Madinah were asked for their ruling on it, many jurists including several companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) ruled that Aishah would have to make an expiation for the zihar. After citing this incident Ibrahim Nakhai has expressed his own opinion, saying that if Aishah had said this thing after the marriage it would not have entailed the expiation. But since she said this before marriage when she had the option to marry, or not to marry, the expiation became obligatory on her.

(3) The excuse of a sensible and mature person, who pronounces the express words of zihar in his full senses, cannot be acceptable that he uttered the words in a state of anger, or in jest, or in love, or that he had no intention of the zihar. However, in respect of the words which are not express in this regard, and which can give different meanings, the injunction will vary according to their nature. Below we shall tell what words of zihar are expressed and what words are not expressed.

(4) It is agreed upon by all that zihar can be pronounced on the woman who is a wedded wife of the man. However, there is a difference of opinion whether zihar can also be pronounced on the other woman or not. In this matter, the following are the different viewpoints:
The Hanafis say that if a man says to the other woman: If I marry you, you will be for me as the back of my mother, then whenever he marries her, he will not be allowed to touch her without first making the expiation. This same is the verdict of Umar. During his caliphate a man said such words to a woman and afterwards married her. Umar ruled that he would have to make the expiation for the zihar.

The Malikis and the Hanbalis have also expressed the same opinion, and they add this to it: If the woman was not specified, but the man said words to the effect that all women

were for him like that, then whichever woman he married, he would have to make the expiation before touching her. The same is the opinion of Saed bin al- Musayyab, Urwah bin Zubair, Ata bin Abi Rabah, Hasan Basri and Ishaq bin Rahawaiyh.

The Shafeis say that zihar before marriage is meaningless. Ibn Abbas and Qatadah also hold the same opinion.

(5) Can zihar be pronounced for a fixed term. The Hanafis and the Shafeis say that if a man has pronounced zihar for a certain period of time, he will have to make the expiation if he touches the wife before the expiry of that time; however, the zihar will become ineffective when the time has elapsed. Its argument is the incident concerning Salamah bin Sakhr Bayadi, who had pronounced zihar upon his wife for the month of Ramadan, and the Prophet (peace be upon him) did not tell him that the fixation of the time limit was meaningless. On the contrary, Imam Malik and Ibn Abi Laila say that whenever zihar is pronounced it will be forever and the specification of time will be of no effect, for the prohibition that has occurred cannot become void of its own accord on the expiry of the time.

(6) If the zihar is conditional, expiation will become incumbent whenever the condition is violated. For instance, if a man says to his wife: If I enter the houses you will be to me as the back of my mother, then whenever he enters his house, it will be unlawful for him to touch his wife without first making the expiation.

(7) In case the words of zihar are repeated several times to a wife, the Hanafis and the Shafeis say that whether this is done in one sitting or in several sittings, it will entail as many expiations as the number of the times the word were repeated, unless the man might have repeated the words only to stress what he had said before. Contrary to this, Imam Malik and lmam Ahmad bin Hanbal say that no matter how often the words are repeated, it will entail only one expiation. The same is the view of Shabi, Taus, Ata bin Abi Rabah Hasan Basri and Auzai. Ali’s ruling is that if the repetition is made in one sitting, there will be only

one expiation, and if in different sittings, then there will be as many expiations as the number of the sittings in which the repetition was made. The same is the view of Qatadah ant Amr bin Dinar.

(8) If zihar is pronounced upon two or more wives simultaneously in one and the same set of words, e.g. if addressing them the husband says: You are to me as the back of my mother, the Hanafis and the Shafeis say that separate expiations will have to be made to make each of them lawful. The same is the opinion of Umar, Ali, Urwah bin Zubair, Taus, Ata, Hasan Basri, Ibrahim Nakhai, Sufyan Thauri and Ibn Shihab Zuhri. Imam Malik and Imam Ahmad say that in this case one and the same expiation will suffice for all. Rabiah, Auzai, Ishaq bin Rihawaiyh and Abu Thaur also have expressed the same opinion.

(9) It is agreed upon by all that if a man repeats zihar, again after making expiation for it once, the wife will not be lawful to him unless he makes another expiation.

(10) Although it is sinful, according to the four Imams, to establish marital relations with the wife before making the expiation, and the man should ask for Allah’s forgiveness for it, and should refrain from repeating such a thing, yet it will entail only one expiation. The Prophet (peace be upon him) had exhorted the people who had committed such an offense in his time to implore Allah for forgiveness and not to touch the wife unless they had made the expiation, but he did not enjoin any additional expiation besides the expiation for zihar. Amr bin Aas, Qabisah bin Dhuaib, Saed bin Jubair, Zuhri and Qatadah say that it will entail two expiations and Hasan Basri and Ibrahim Nakhai have given the opinion that this will entail three expiations. Probably the Ahadith in which the Prophet (peace be upon him) gave his ruling on this matter did not reach these scholars.

(11) As to comparison of the wife to whom would be zihar, the jurists have expressed different views:

Amir Shabi says that her comparison to the mother only is zihar, and the Zahiriyyah say that her comparison only to the mother's back is zihar, for the injunction does not apply to anything else. No section of the Islamic jurists, however; agrees with them in this regard, for the reason given by the Quran of the wife's comparison to the mother being sinful is that it is absurd and a lie. Now, obviously comparison of the wife to the women whose sanctity is just like the mother's would be as absurd as it is in the case of the mother. Therefore, there is no reason why the commandment in that case should not be the same as in the can of the comparison to the mother.

The Hanafis say that in this command are included all those women, who are permanently prohibited to man on the basis of lineage, fosterage, or marital relationship, but the women who may only be temporarily prohibited and can become lawful at any time, are not included in this, e.g. the wife's sister, her maternal and paternal aunts, or another woman, who is not the men's wedded wife. It will be zihar if comparison is made with such a part of the permanently prohibited woman's body as is forbidden for men to look at. However, it will not be zihar if comparison is made of the wife's hand, foot, head, hair, tooth, etc. to the back of a permanently prohibited woman, or of the wife to her head, hand, foot, etc. for it is not unlawful to look at these parts of the mother's or sister's body. Likewise, to say to the wife: Your hand is like my mother's hand, or your foot is like my mother's foot, is not zihar.
The Shafeis say that in this command are included only those women, who were, and are, permanently prohibited, i.e. mother, sister, daughter etc. but this does not include those women, who may have been lawful at some time, e.g. the foster-mother, foster-sister, mother-in-law and daughter-in-law, or those who may become lawful at any time, e.g. the wife's sister. Apart from these temporarily prohibited women, it will be zihar to compare the wife to such parts of the permanently prohibited woman's body as are not normally mentioned out of reverence and respect, As for those parts which are mentioned out of reverence and respect, it will be zihar to make a comparison with them only in case this is done with the intention of zihar; for instance, if a

man says to his wife: You are to me like my mother’s eye, or like my mother's hand, foot or belly, or he compares the wife’s belly, or breast, with the mother’s belly, or breast, or says that the wife’s head, back or hand is to him as his mother, it will be zihar if said with the intention of zihar and reverence if said with the intention of reverence.

The Malikis say that to compare the wife to any of the prohibited women is zihar, so much so that even if a man says to his wife: You are to me like the back of such and such other woman, it would be zihar. Furthermore, they say that it would be zihar to compare any part of the mother’s body, or of an eternally prohibited woman’s body, to the wife, or to any part of the wife’s body, without any condition that the parts thus compared be such as may look at any part of the mother’s body as he looks at the wife’s.

The Hanbalis include in this command all those women, who may be eternally prohibited, though they may have been lawful before, e.g. the mother-in law, or foster mother. As for the women who may become lawful at any time later (e.g. the wife’s sister), Imam Ahmad’s one statement concerning them is that comparison to them is not zihar. Moreover, according to the Hanbalis to compare any part of the wife’s body to any part of the prohibited woman’s comes under zihar. However, the non-permanent parts like the hair, nails, teeth, etc. are excluded from this command.

(12) The jurists agree that to say to the wife: You are to me like the back of my mother, is expressly zihar, for the Arabs used this very formula for zihar, and the Quranic command was also sent down only concerning this. However, the jurists have disagreed as to which of the other words are such as clearly come under zihar, and which are such whose amounting or not amounting to zihar will be dependent upon the speaker’s intention.

With the Hanafis, the express words of zihar are those in which a lawful woman (the wife) may have been clearly compared

to an unlawful woman (i.e. any woman from among the eternally prohibited women), or compared to such part of the body which is forbidden for a man to look at, like saying: You are to me like the belly or the thigh of my mother, or of such and such prohibited woman. Apart from these, the other words are disputed. According to Imam Abu Hanifah, if the man says: You are forbidden to me like the back of my mother, it is expressly zihar, but according to Imams Abu Yusuf and Muhammad it would be zihar if there was the intention of zihar and divorce if there was the intention of divorce. The view generally held by the Hanafis is that if the man says: You are as my mother, or like my mother, it is zihar if said with the intention of zihar and irrevocable divorce if said with the intention of divorce, and meaningless if there was no such intention at all. However, according to Imam Muhammad this is express zihar. If the man calls his wife his mother or sister or daughter, it is an absurdity upon which the Prophet (peace be upon him) had expressed great anger, but he did not regard it as zihar. If the man says: You are forbidden to me like my mother, it would be zihar if said with the intention of zihar, and divorce if said with the intention of divorce, and zihar if there was no intention at all. If he says: You are to me like my mother, or as my mother, his intention will be questioned. If he said this out of respect and reverence, it would be respect and reverence, if with the intention of divorce, it would be divorce. If there was no intention whatsoever, it would be meaningless according to Imam Abu Hanifah, but would entail the atonement of the oath, though not of zihar according to Imam Abu Yusuf and would be zihar according to Imam Muhammad.

With the Shafeis, the express words of zihar are that a man should say to his wife: You are to me, or with me, or for me, like the back of my mother, or you are like the back of my mother, or your body, or yourself, is to me like the body or self of my mother. Apart from these, in respect of all other words the decision will be dependent on the speaker’s intention.

According to the Hanbalis, every such word by which a man may have compared his wife, or a part from among the permanent parts of her body, to a prohibited woman, or to a part

from among the permanent parts of the prohibited woman's body clearly, would be regarded as express in the matter of zihar.

The Malikis' viewpoint is almost the same. However, in the details they have given different rulings For instance, according to them, a man's saying to his wife: You are to me as my mother, or like my mother, is zihar if said with the intention of zihar, divorce if said with the intention of divorce, and zihar if there was no intention at all. According to the Hanbalis, it may be regarded only as zihar provided there was the intention. If a man says to his wife: You are my mother, this is zihar according to the MalikIs, but according to the Hanbalis it would be zihar if said in a state of anger on account of a quarrel, and it would not be zihar if it was said out of love and affection, although it is wrong. If a man says: You have divorce on you: you are like my mother, according to the Hanbalis this is divorce, not zihar, and if he says: You arc like my mother: you have divorce on you, both zihar and divorce will take place. To say: you are forbidden to me as the back of my mother, is zihar according to both the Malikis and the Hanbalis, whether the words were said with the intention of divorce, or without any intention.

In this discussion about the words of zihar one should clearly understand that all the disputes of the jurists in this regard relate to the words and usage of the Arabic language. Obviously the people who speak other languages will neither pronounce zihar in Arabic nor will utter an exact and accurate translation of the Arabic words and sentences at the time they pronounce zihar. Therefore, if one has to decide whether a word or a sentence comes under the definition of zihar, or not, one should not examine it from the point of view of its being an exact translation of the words given by the jurists, but one should only see whether the speaker had compared his wife in the sexual context clearly to any of the women in the prohibited degrees, or whether there was the probability of other meanings also in his words. Its most conspicuous example is the Arabic sentence itself about which all the jurists and commentators agree that this very sentence was used for zihar in Arabic, i.e. Anti alayya kazahri ummi (you are to me like the back of my mother). Probably, in no other language of the world can the man pronouncing zihar use words that may be

a literal translation of this Arabic sentence. However, he can certainly use words of his own language, which may have precisely the same meaning for which an Arab used this sentence. The meaning of this sentence was: To have sexual intercourse with you would be like having sexual intercourse with my mother, or as some foolish person might say to his wife: If I come in to you, I would be going in to my mother.

(13) In the Quran what has been mentioned as entailing the expiation is not the mere zihar but one's aud (returning) after the zihar. That is, if a man only pronounces the zihar and does not return, he does not incur any expiation. Now, the question is, what is this aud (returning) that entails the expiation. In this regard, the jurists have held the following viewpoints:
The Hanafis say that aud is the intention to have the sexual intercourse, but it does not mean that the mere intention should entail the expiation; so much so that the man may have to make the expiation even if he does not take any practical step after the intention. But its correct meaning is that the man who wishes to remove the prohibition that he had imposed on him by pronouncing zihar of severing marital relations with his wife, should first make the expiation, for this prohibition cannot be removed without the expiation.

Three statements have been cited from Imam Malik in this regard, but his most well-known and authentic statement, according to the Malikis, is in full agreement with the Hanafi viewpoint, as stated above. He says that what the man had made unlawful for himself by zihar was the sexual relation with his wife. Now, aud means that he should return to establish the same relation with her.
Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal's view as cited by Ibn Qadamah is almost the same as of the two Imams as noted above. He says that after the zihar, expiation has necessarily to be made to make the sexual intercourse lawful. The man who wants to make it lawful after having pronounced zihar, in fact, wants to return from the prohibition. Therefore, he has been enjoined to make the expiation before making it lawful for himself, precisely like the

man who wants to make the other woman lawful for himself and has to marry her before she could be lawful for him.

Imam Shafeis viewpoint is quite different. He says that a man's keeping his wife as usual and detaining her in wedlock as before after having pronounced zihar is aud, for as soon as he pronounced zihar he, in fact, forbade himself to keep her as wife. Therefore, if he did not divorce her immediately on pronouncing zihar and kept her back for so long that he could utter the words of divorce, he committed aud and the expiation became incumbent upon him. This means that if after pronouncing zihar the man did not pronounce divorce in the next breath, expiation would become incumbent, whether afterwards he might decide not to keep the woman as wife and might have no intention of having marital relations with her. So much so that even if he divorced his wife after a few moments' thought, according to Imam Shafei, he would still have to make the expiation.

(14) The Quranic injunction is that the pronouncer of zihar must make the expiation before the two, the husband and the wife, touch each other. All the four Imams agree that according to this verse not only is the sexual intercourse prohibited before the expiation but it is also prohibited that the husband touch the wife in any way. The Shafei's regard only touching with desire as prohibited. The Hanbalis regard every kind of pleasure seeking as forbidden; and the Malikis regard even casting of the look at the wife's body for the sake of pleasure as unlawful. According to them only casting of the look at the face and hands is an exception.

(15) If after zihar, a man divorces his wife, he cannot touch her without first making the expiation in case it is a revocable divorce. If it is an irrevocable divorce, and he remarries her, he still will have to make the expiation before he could touch her. So much so that even if he has divorced her thrice, and the woman after marrying another man becomes a widow, or is divorced, and then the pronouncer of zihar remarries her, she will not be lawful to him unless he first makes the expiation. For, he has forbidden her to himself by comparing her to his mother or

other prohibited woman, and this prohibition cannot be removed without the expiation. All the four Imams agree about this.

(16) It is incumbent upon the woman that she should not allow the husband who has pronounced zihar on her to touch her until he makes the expiation. And since the marital relationship is a right of the woman of which the husband has deprived her by zihar, she can go to the court of law if he does not make the expiation. The court will compel the husband to make the expiation to remove the barrier he has raised between himself and her. And if he does not comply, the court can award him lashes or imprisonment or both. This also is agreed upon by all the four schools of law. However, the difference is that in the Hanafi Fiqh this is the only way out for the woman; if the court does not help her out of the situation, she will remain suspended under zihar indefinitely. For, zihar does not dissolve the marriage contract, it only forbids the husband to have marital relations with the wife. According to the Maliki school if the husband pronounces zihar and keeps the wife suspended with a view to punish her, the law of eila will be applied against him, which means that he cannot keep her suspended for more than four months. (For the law of eila, see (E.Ns 245 to 247 of Surah Al- Baqarah). According to the Shafeis, although in zihar the law of eila can be applied only if the husband might have pronounced zihar for a specific period, which does not exceed four months. Yet, since according to them the expiation becomes incumbent upon the husband from the very moment he keeps back the woman as wife, it is not possible that he may keep her suspended for a long period indefinitely.

(17) The express commandment of the Quran and the sunnah is that the first expiation for zihar is to free a slave. If a man cannot afford this, he can expiate by fasting two months consecutively; and if he cannot do even this, then he can feed 60 poor. But if a man cannot expiate in any of the three ways, he will have to wait till he has the means to act in one or the other way, because the Shariah has not prescribed any other form of expiation. However, the sunnah confirms that such a person should be helped out so that he can make the third kind of the expiation. The Prophet (peace be upon him) helped such people

out of the public treasury, who were caught in this awkward situation by a mistake of their own, and were helpless to expiate in any of the three prescribed ways.

(18) The Quran enjoins to release a neck (raqabah) as expiation, which applies both to a male and a female slave, and there is no restriction of the age in it. It would be sufficient to release a suckling child who may be in the state of slavery. However, the jurists have disagreed whether both the believing and the unbelieving slaves can be released, or whether only the believing slave will have to be released. The Hanafis and the Zahiriyyah say that it is enough to release a slave, whether a believer or an unbeliever, as expiation for zihar for the Quran only mentions raqabah (the neck); it does not say that it has to be a believer. On the contrary; the Shafeis, the Malikis and the Hanbalis impose the condition that it has to be a believing slave. They have held this injunction as analogous to the other expiations in which release of raqabah has been made conditional upon his being a believer.

(19) If the pronouncer of zihar cannot afford to release a slave, the Quran enjoins him to fast for two successive months before the two can touch each other. As for the details of acting on this divine command, the viewpoints of the different juristic schools are as follows:

(a) All agree that the months imply the lunar months. If fasting is begun with the sighting of the new moon, one will have to complete two months' un-interrupted fasting. If fasting is begun on another date in the month, according to the Hanafis and the Hanbalis, one will have to fast for 60 days consecutively; and according to the Shafeis, one will observe a total of 30 fasts in the first and the third months and observe the whole of the middle lunar month, whether it is of 29 days or 30 days.

(b) The Hanafis and the Shafeis say that fasting should be begun at a time when within the next two months there should neither fall the month of Ramadan nor the two Eid days, nor the day of sacrifice, nor the

Tashriq days (10th to 13th of Dhil-Hajj) for the observance of the Ramadan fast and its abandonment on the Eid days and the day of Sacrifice ant Tashriq days, in the course of the expiation fasting, would break the succession of the fasting, and the pronouncer of zihar would have to start fasting afresh. The Hanbalis say that observance of the Ramadan fast and its abandonment on the forbidden days do not break the succession.

(c) In the course of the two months whether one abandons a fast on account of a valid excuse, or without a valid excuse, in both cases the succession will break according to the Hanafis and the Shafeis, and one will have to start fasting afresh. The same is the opinion of Imam Muhammad Baqir, Ibrahim Nahkai, Saed bin Jubair, and Sufyan Thauri. According to Imam Malik and Imam Ahmad, fasting can be abandoned on account of illness or a journey and this does not break the succession; however, succession does break if the fast is abandoned without a valid reason. Their reasoning is that the nature of the expiation fast is not obligatory as of the Ramadan fast: when that fast can be abandoned on account of an excuse, there is no reason why this cannot be. The same is the viewpoint of Abdullah bin Abbas, Hasan Basri, Ata bin Abi Rabah, Said bin al- Masayyab, Amr bin Dinar, Shabi, Taus, Mujahid, Ishaq bin Rahawaiyh, Abu Ubaid and Abu Thaur.

(d) If the man commits sexual intercourse with the wife under zihar within the two months of fasting, according to all the Imams, the succession will break, and he will have to begin fasting anew, for he has been enjoined to fast for two successive months before he could touch the wife.

(20) According to the Quran and the Sunnah, the third kind of expiation (feeding the 60 poor) can be made only by him who does not have the power to make the second expiation (fasting for two months successively). The details of acting on this command as worked out by the jurists are as follows.

(a) According to all the four Imams, being powerless to observe the fast means that one should either he powerless due to old age, or due to illness, or due to the reason that one may not be able to abstain from sexual intercourse for two successive months, and may become impatient at any time in the course of fasting. The validity of all these three excuses is confirmed by the Ahadith that have been cited in connection with the cases of Aus bin Samit Ansari and Salamah bin Sakhr Bayadi. However, about illness there is a little difference of opinion among the jurists. The Hanafis say that the excuse of illness will be valid only in case there is no hope of recovery, or there is the fear that the disease may worsen on account of fasting. The Shafeis say that if fasting is likely to cause a severe hardship by which the man may feel the danger of its being interrupted, this excuse also can be valid. The Malikis say that if the man strongly feels that he will be able to observe the fast in the future, he may wait till then, and if he has no such feeling, he should feed the poor. The Hanbalis say that the apprehension that the disease will worsen by fasting is a sufficient excuse for not fasting.

(b) Food can be given only to those poor people whose maintenance is not the obligatory responsibility of the man concerned.

(c) The Hanafis say that food can be given to both the Muslim and the non-Muslim subjects of the Islamic State, but not to the belligerent disbelievers and to those who have been given protection. The Malikis, the Shafeis and the Hanbalis say that the Muslim needy ones only can be fed.

(d) There is full agreement that feeding implies to feed two times a day to fill. However, there is a difference of opinion about the meaning of feeding. The Hanafis say that it is equally valid to feed with cooked food two times a day or to give away grain sufficient to meet the food requirements of a needy person two times a day, For the Quran has used the word itam, which means both to provide food and to feed. But the Malikis, the Shafeis

and the Hanbalis do not regard feeding with cooked food as correct; they think it is necessary to give away grain. In case grain is given, there is full agreement that the grain should be the staple food in the city or area, and all the poor people should be given it equally.

(e) According to the Hanafis, it is also valid if one and the same poor person is fed or given food for 60 days, though it is not correct to give him food for 60 days on one and the same day. However, the other three schools do not think it is valid to provide food to one and the same poor man; it is necessary to give food to 60 persons. It is not permissible in any of the four schools to provide food to 60 men at one time and to another 60 at another time.

(f) This is also not permissible according to any of the four schools that one may fast for 30 days and then feed 30 poor ones, for two different expiations cannot be combined. If one has to fast, he should fast for two months successively, and if one has to feed, he should feed 60 poor once.

(g) Although in connection with the expiation of feeding the Quran does not use words to the effect that this expiation should also be made before the husband and the wife can touch each other yet the context demands that this restriction will apply to this third kind of expiation as well. That is why the four Imams do not regard it as permissible that the man should go to his wife during the time the expiation of feeding is being performed. However, the difference is that according to the Hanbalis the man who commits this offense, will have to feed the poor afresh, but the Hanafis show leniency, for in respect of this third expiation there is no mention of before the two touch each other in the Quran, and this provides a basis for the concession.

Bibligraphies

Hanafi Fiqh: Hedayah; Fath al-Qadir; Bidai-us-Sunat; Al Jassas Ahkam al-Quran.

Shafei Fiqh: An-Nawawi, Al-Minhaj together with Sharh Mughni al-Muhtaj; Tafsir Kabir

Malaki Fiqh: Hashah ad-Dusuqi ala-sh-Sharh al-Kabir; Hedayar al-Mujtahid; Ibn al-Arabi, Ahkam al-Quran

Hanbali Fiqh: Ibn Qudamah, Al Mughni

Zahiriyyah Fiqh: Ibn Hazm, Al Mualla

(12) So that you may believe: So that you may adopt the attitude of a true and sincere believer. Obviously, the addressees of this verse are not the pagans and polytheists, but the Muslims who had already affirmed the faith. To tell them, after reciting to them a Shariah injunction: This is being enjoined so that you may believe in Allah and His Messenger, clearly signifies that the conduct of the person who continues to follow the traditional law of paganism even after hearing the divine command would be contradictory to his profession of the faith. It is not the character of a believer that when Allah and His Messenger have prescribed a law for him in some matter of life, he should set it aside and follow some other law of the world, or go on following his own wishes and desires.

(13) Here “disbeliever” does not imply the denier of Allah and His Messenger (peace be upon him), but the person who adopts the attitude and conduct of a disbeliever even after affirming faith in Allah and His Messenger (peace be upon him). In other words, it means: This, in fact, is a characteristic of the disbelievers that even after hearing the command of Allah and His Messenger (peace be upon him), they should go on following their own whims, and continue to practice the customs of ignorance, for a true and sincere believer would never adopt such an attitude. The same thing has been said in Surah Aal-Imran after enjoining the imperative duty of Hajj: And the one who disbelieves (i.e. does not obey this commandment), then Allah is Self- Sufficient and does not stand in need of anyone in the worlds. (Verse 97). At neither place has the word kufr been used in the sense that whoever continues to have marital relations with the wife after zihar without making the expiation, or thinks that divorce has taken place by the mere pronouncement of zihar on the wife, or does not go to perform Hajj, in spite of the means, should be declared

an apostate and disbeliever by the religious court and regarded as excommunicated by the Muslims. But it means that in the sight of Allah such people as may reject His commandments by word or deed, or may at least bother to know as to what bounds their Lord has set for them, what He has forbidden and what He has enjoined, what He has made lawful and what unlawful, are not counted among the believers.

اِنَّ الَّذِيْنَ يُحَآدُّوْنَ اللّٰهَ وَ رَسُوْلَهٗ كُبِتُوْا كَمَا كُبِتَ الَّذِيْنَ مِنْ قَبْلِهِمْ وَ قَدْ اَنْزَلْنَآ اٰيٰتٍۢ بَيِّنٰتٍ ؕ وَ لِلْكٰفِرِيْنَ عَذَابٌ مُّهِيْنٌ ۖ﴿۵﴾

(58:5) Verily those who oppose Allah and His Messenger [14] shall be brought low even as those before them were brought low.[15] Surely We have sent down Clear Signs; and a humiliating chastisement awaits the unbelievers;[16]

(14) Those who oppose: Those who do not recognize the bounds set by Allah and instead set some other bounds for themselves. Ibn Jarir Tabari has given this commentary of this verse: That is, the people who resist Allah with regard to the bounds and duties enjoined by Him, and set for themselves some other bounds instead of the bounds set by Him. Baidawi has given this commentary of it: That is, they show hostility towards and dispute with Allah and His Messenger (peace be upon him), or set other bounds for themselves than the bounds set by them, or adopt the bounds set by others. Alusi in his Ruh Al-Maani has concurred with Baidawi in this commentary and cited the statement of Shaikh-ul-Islam Sadullah Chalpi to the effect: In this verse a threat has been held out to those kings and evil rulers who have framed many such rules as are opposed to the bounds set by the Shariah, and called them law. Here, Allama Alusi has dwelt upon the constitutional status (i.e. constitutional from the Islamic viewpoint) of the manmade laws as against the Shariah laws and concluded thus:

There can be no doubt in the disbelief of the person who regards this law as commendable and superior to the Shariah and says that it is wiser and better suited to the genius of the people. And when the Shariah injunction in a particular matter is pointed out to him, he is angry, as we have seen some of those who are under the curse of Allah.

(15) The word used in the original is kubt, which means to disgrace, to destroy, to curse, to drive off, to push out, to debase. What is meant to be said is that the communities of the former Prophets who resisted Allah and His Messenger (peace be upon him) and rebelled against His commandments have already gone

to their doom. Now those from among the Muslims who adopt the same attitude in life will also meet with the same evil end. Whenever the people made their own laws contradictory to divine law, or adopted laws made by others, they were deprived of Allah's bounty and grace, with the result that their lives were filled with deviations, immoralities and moral and social evils, which caused them to be ultimately degraded and humiliated oven in this world. If the same error now is committed by the community of the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him), there is no reason why it should continue to be regarded with favor by Allah and He may go on protecting it from a disgraceful destruction for ever and ever. Allah had neither any ill will against the communities of His former Messengers nor has He any special connection with the community of this Messenger (peace be upon him).

(16) A little consideration of the context shows that here two punishments of this attitude have been mentioned:

(1) Kubt, i.e. debasement and humiliation of this world.
(2) Adhab muhin, i.e. a disgraceful torment that they will suffer in the Hereafter.

يَوْمَ يَبْعَثُهُمُ اللّٰهُ جَمِيعًا فَيُنَبِّئُهُم بِمَا عَمِلُوا ؕ اَحْصٰهُ اللّٰهُ وَ نَسُوْهُ ؕ وَ اللّٰهُ عَلٰى كُلِّ شَىْءٍ شَهِيْدٌ ۝٦

(58:6) a chastisement that shall come upon them on the Day when Allah will raise them all to a new life and will inform them of their deeds. (17) Allah has recorded it all while they have forgotten it. Allah is a witness over everything.

(17) That is, their having forgotten their own attitude and conduct does not mean that it is dead and forgotten altogether. For them the disobedience of God and resistance to His commands may be an ordinary matter which they may forget easily once they have indulged in it and may not even regard it as anything objectionable, which they should have avoided, yet in the sight of God it is no ordinary matter at all. With Him every misdeed of theirs has been noted down, His register contains a

full record of every deed done by a person, when and where it was done, what was his own reaction to it, what were its consequences and how far and in what forms did they appear and spread in the world.

اَلَمْ تَرَ اَنَّ اللّٰہَ یَعْلَمُ مَا فِی السَّمٰوٰتِ وَ مَا فِی الْاَرْضِ ؕ مَا یَکُوْنُ مِنْ نَّجْوٰی ثَلٰثَۃٍ اِلَّا ہُوَ رَابِعُہُمْ وَلَا خَمْسَۃٍ اِلَّا ہُوَ سَادِسُہُمْ وَلَاۤ اَدْنٰی مِنْ ذٰلِکَ وَلَاۤ اَکْثَرَ اِلَّا ہُوَ مَعَہُمْ اَیْنَ مَا کَانُوْا ۚ ثُمَّ یُنَبِّئُہُمْ بِمَا عَمِلُوْا یَوْمَ الْقِیٰمَۃِ ؕ اِنَّ اللّٰہَ بِکُلِّ شَیْءٍ عَلِیْمٌ ﴿۷﴾

(58:7) Are you not aware [18] that Allah knows whatever is in the heavens and whatever is in the earth? Never is there any whispering among three but He is their fourth; nor among five but He is their sixth; [19] nor fewer nor more but He is with them wherever they may be. [20] And then He will tell them on the Day of Judgement all that they have done. Surely Allah knows everything.

(18) From here to verse 10 continuously the hypocrites have been taken to task for the attitude they had adopted in the Muslim society. Although apparently they were a part of the Muslim community, secretly they were a separate group from the believers. Whenever the Muslims saw them, they found them whispering secretly together. That is how they conspired and made all sorts of plans in order to create rifts in the ranks of the Muslims, and to cause alarm and spread mischief among them. 19. The question may arise why have three and five been mentioned here instead of two and three? Why has two and then four been left out? The commentators have given many answers to this question but in our opinion the correct answer is that this style has been adopted for maintaining the literary beauty of the Quran. Without this the style would have suffered from blemishes. Therefore, after making mention of three and five whisperers the gap has been filled up in the following sentence by saying: whether the whisperers are fewer than three, or more than five, in any case Allah is always with them.

(20) This Allah’s being associated with them is, in fact, in the sense of Allah’s being All-Knowing and All-Aware, All- Hearing and All-Seeing and His being absolute in power, and not in the sense

that Allah, God forbid, is a person who is secretly and invisibly present among the five persons as their sixth associate. This, in fact, is meant to make the people realize that they may be holding secret counsels in safe and hidden places and may be able to conceal their plans from the world but they cannot keep them concealed from Allah, that they may escape from every power of the world, but they cannot escape the grasp of Allah.

اَلَمْ تَرَ اِلَى الَّذِيْنَ نُهُوْا عَنِ النَّجْوٰى ثُمَّ يَعُوْدُوْنَ لِمَا نُهُوْا عَنْهُ وَ يَتَنٰجَوْنَ بِالْاِثْمِ وَ الْعُدْوَانِ وَ مَعْصِيَتِ الرَّسُوْلِ وَ اِذَا جَآءُوْكَ حَيَّوْكَ بِمَا لَمْ يُحَيِّكَ بِهِ اللّٰهُ وَ يَقُوْلُوْنَ فِيْٓ اَنْفُسِهِمْ لَوْ لَا يُعَذِّبُنَا اللّٰهُ بِمَا نَقُوْلُ ؕ حَسْبُهُمْ جَهَنَّمُ ۚ يَصْلَوْنَهَا ۚ فَبِئْسَ الْمَصِيْرُ ۸

(58:8) Have you not seen those who were forbidden to whisper and yet they engaged in what they had been forbidden? (21) They secretly converse among themselves concerning sin and transgression and disobedience to the Messenger. And when they come to you, they greet you in a manner that Allah does not greet you, (22) and say to themselves: “Why does Allah not chastise us for these utterances of ours?” (23) Hell it is that shall suffice them, and in it will they burn. How woeful is their destination!

(21) This shows that before the revelation of this verse the Prophet (peace be upon him) had forbidden the people this practice. Yet when they did not desist, Allah directly sent down this verse containing His warning and wrath for such people.

(22) This was the common practice of the Jews and the hypocrites. According to several traditions, some Jews came before the Prophet (peace be upon him) and said: Assam alaika ya abul-Qasim. That is, they pronounced as-sam alaika in such a manner as to give the impression that they had said as-salam alaika (peace be on you), which is the Islamic way of greeting. But actually they had said sam, instead of salam, which means death. In response the Prophet said: wa-alaikum. Aishah retorted: May death visit you and the curse of Allah. The Prophet warned her, saying: Aishah, Allah does not like abusive language. She submitted: Didn’t you hear, O Messenger of Allah what they said. The Prophet (peace be upon him) replied: And didn’t you hear what reply I gave? I said: And the same upon you. (Bukhari,

Muslim, Ibn Jarir, Ibn Abi Hatim). Abdullah bin Abbas has stated that both the Jews and the hypocrites had adopted this very way of greeting. (Ibn Jarir).

(23) That is, they regarded it as a proof of the Prophet's (peace be upon him) not being a Messenger. They thought that if he had been a true Messenger, they would be punished by a torment as soon as they greeted him in that way. Since there was no torment while they were greeting him day and night like that, he was not a Messenger of Allah.

يٰۤاَيُّهَا الَّذِيۡنَ اٰمَنُوۡۤا اِذَا تَنٰجَيۡتُمۡ فَلَا تَتَنٰجَوۡا بِالۡاِثۡمِ وَ الۡعُدۡوٰنِ وَ مَعۡصِيَتِ الرَّسُوۡلِ وَتَنٰجَوۡا بِالۡبِرِّ وَ التَّقۡوٰى ؕ وَ اتَّقُوا اللّٰهَ الَّذِىۡۤ اِلَيۡهِ تُحۡشَرُوۡنَ ۝٩

(58:9) Believers, when you converse in secrecy, let that not be concerning sin and transgression and disobedience to the Messenger; rather, converse concerning virtue and piety. And fear Allah to Whom all of you shall be mustered.[24]

(24) This shows that najwa (talking secretly together) by itself is not forbidden, but it is being lawful or unlawful depends upon the character of the people who hold secret consultations and upon the circumstances under which such consultations are held, and upon nature of the consultations themselves, If the people whose sincerity, righteousness and purity of character are well known, are seen talking secretly together, nobody would have any misgiving that they were planning mischief. On the contrary, the whispering and secret consultations of the people who are notorious for their evil and wicked character, produce in every mind, the suspicion that they are engaged in a new conspiracy. Likewise, if a couple of persons talk for some time together on some matter secretly, it is not objectionable, but if some people have formed themselves into a gang and constantly engaged in a whispering campaign against the Muslim community, this would indeed be a prelude to some mischief. If nothing else, it would at least stir up divisions among the Muslims. Above all, the thing that decides whether najwa (secret counsel) is lawful or unlawful is the nature of the things talked of it. If two men hold a secret counsel in order to bring a dispute the an end, and to restore a

person’s right, or to bring a dispute to an end, or to restore a person’s right, or to promote a good cause, it is no evil, but rather and an act of virtue, On the contrary, if the same secret counsel between two men is held with a view to creating mischief, or usurping the rights of others, or committing a sin, obviously the object itself would be evil and the secret counsel about it evil added to evil.

In this connection, the teaching given by the Prophet (peace be upon him) of social etiquette is: When three men are sitting together, no two of them should whisper to each other, for this would cause anguish to the third. (Bukhari, Muslim, Musnad Ahmad, Thirmidhi, Adu Daud). In another Hadith, the Prophet (peace be upon him) said: Two men should not whisper together, without the leave of the third, for this would cause him anguish. (Muslim). This objectionable sort of whispering also applies to the case when two of the three men start talking in a language which is not understood by the third, and even more objectionable would be that during their whispering they should look towards the third person or gesticulate in a manner as to suggest that he is the topic of discussion between them.

اِنَّمَا النَّجْوٰى مِنَ الشَّيْطٰنِ لِيَحْزُنَ الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا وَلَيْسَ بِضَآرِّهِمْ شَيْـًٔا اِلَّا بِاِذْنِ اللّٰهِ ؕ وَ عَلَى اللّٰهِ فَلْيَتَوَكَّلِ الْمُؤْمِنُوْنَ ۝١٠

(58:10) Whispering is an act of Satan, one that aims at causing grief to the believers; yet without Allah's leave no harm can be caused to them. So in Allah should the believers put all their trust. (25)

(25) This has been said so that if a Muslim watches some other people whispering, which causes him the doubt that it is directed against him, he should not feel so offended as to start planning a counter-attack on the basis of mere suspicion, or begin to nourish grief, or malice, or undue concern in his heart. He should understand that no one can harm him except by Allah’s leave. This conviction would inspire him with such confidence that he would feel delivered of many a useless worry and imaginary danger and leaving the wicked to themselves would remain

engaged in peacefully doing his duty. The believer who has trust in Allah is neither a faint-hearted person, whose peace of mind could be ruined by every doubt and suspicions nor so shallow and mean-minded as would lose his cool when confronted by the evildoers and start behaving in an unjust manner himself.

يٰۤاَيُّهَا الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْۤا اِذَا قِيْلَ لَكُمْ تَفَسَّحُوْا فِى الْمَجٰلِسِ فَافْسَحُوْا يَفْسَحِ اللّٰهُ لَكُمْ ۚ وَ اِذَا قِيْلَ انْشُزُوْا فَانْشُزُوْا يَرْفَعِ اللّٰهُ الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مِنْكُمْ ۙ وَ الَّذِيْنَ اُوْتُوا الْعِلْمَ دَرَجٰتٍ ؕ وَ اللّٰهُ بِمَا تَعْمَلُوْنَ خَبِيْرٌ ۝١١

(58:11) Believers, when you are told: “Make room for one another in your assemblies,” then make room; Allah will bestow amplitude on you. (26) And when it is said: “Rise up,” then rise up; (27) Allah will raise to high ranks[28] those of you who believe and are endowed with knowledge. Allah is well aware of all that you do.

(26) This has been explained in the introduction to this Surah. Some commentators regard this command as restricted to the assemblies of the Prophet (peace be upon him). But as pointed out by Imam Malik, the correct view is that this is a general instruction for the assemblies held by the Muslims. One of the rules of etiquette taught by Allah and His Messenger (peace be upon him) to the Muslims is that when they are sitting in an assembly and some more people arrive, they should have the courtesy to accommodate the newcomers and should squeeze in together as far as possible to make room for them to sit. The new-comers should also have the courtesy not to press in forcibly and make others rise up in order to take their place. In the Hadith Abdullah bin Umar and Abu Hurairah have reported that the Prophet (peace be upon him) said: Nobody should make another person rise up so as to take his place, but you should yourself make room for others. (Musnad Ahmad, Bukhari, Muslim). And Abdullah bin Amr bin Aas reports that the Prophet (peace be upon him) said: It is not lawful for a person that he should forcibly press in between two men except by their leave. (Musnad Ahmad, Abu Daud, Tirmidhi).

(27) Abdur Rahman bin Zaid bin Aslam has stated that the people used to prolong their sitting in the Prophet's (peace be upon him) assemblies and tried to sit till the end. This caused him inconvenience and discomfort as well as hindrance in his daily chores. At this Allah sent down this command, teaching the people the etiquette: When you are told to rise up froth the assembly, you should rise up and disperse. (Ibn Jarir, Ibn Kathir).

(28) That is, you should not think that if in the Prophet's (peace be upon him) assembly you had to sit a little farther away from him for the sake of making room for others, you would be reduced in rank or if you were asked to rise up and disperse from the assembly, you were disgraced. The real means of exaltation of ranks is faith and knowledge, and not an opportunity to sit nearest to the Prophet (peace be upon him) in his assembly and sit the longest. If a person happened to sit nearer to him, it does not mean that he became exalted in rank, for the high ranks belong only to those who have attained to the wealth of knowledge and faith. Likewise, the person who prolonged his sitting with the Prophet (peace be upon him) only to cause him inconvenience and discomfort, in fact, displayed lack of good manners. His there sitting near him for a long time will not exalt him in rank in any way. Far higher and exalted in rank in the sight of Allah is he who attained to taste faith and knowledge and imbibed the morals that should belong to a believer.

يٰۤاَيُّهَا الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْۤا اِذَا نَاجَيْتُمُ الرَّسُوْلَ فَقَدِّمُوْا بَيْنَ يَدَىْ نَجْوٰىكُمْ صَدَقَةً ؕ
ذٰلِكَ خَيْرٌ لَّكُمْ وَ اَطْهَرُ ؕ فَاِنْ لَّمْ تَجِدُوْا فَاِنَّ اللّٰهَ غَفُوْرٌ رَّحِيْمٌ ﴿۱۲﴾

(58:12) Believers, when you come to the Messenger for private consultation, offer some charity before your consultation with him. (29) That is better for you and more conducive to purity. But if you find nothing to offer in charity, then know that Allah is Most Merciful, Most Compassionate.

(29) According to Abdullah bin Abbas, this command was sent down because the Muslims had started requesting the Prophet (peace be upon him) for private counsel much too frequently, and this put him to great inconvenience. At last, Allah willed to relieve

His Prophet (peace be upon him) of this burden. (Ibn Jarir). Zaid bin Aslam says that the Prophet (peace be upon him) would never turn down the request of anyone, who wanted to consult him in private. Whoever desired to have private counsel with him, he would oblige him. Often it so happened that the people would ask for private counsel in matters in which there was no real need. This was the time when all of Arabia was engaged in war against Al-Madinah. Sometimes, after a person had made such a request, Satan would whisper into the ears of the people the idea that he had brought to the Prophet (peace be upon him) the news of invasion by such and such tribes, and this would cause rumors to spread in Al-Madinah. On the other hand, this would give the hypocrites an opportunity to say that Muhammad (peace be upon him) was a credulous person, who listened to and believed in whatever anyone told him. Because of this Allah imposed the restriction that anyone who wanted to have private counsel with the Prophet should first give away something in charity. (Ibn Arabi: Ahkam al-Quran). Qatadah says that some people talked to the Prophet (peace be upon him) in private in order to show their superiority to others.

Ali says when this was enjoined the Prophet (peace be upon him) asked him, What should be the quantity of the charity, should it be one dinar. I said: This is more than the people can afford. The Prophet (peace be upon him) then asked: Should it be half a dinar. I said: This is also too much. Then he asked what it should be. I said: Gold equal to a barley grain. The Prophet (peace be upon him) remarked: Your advice is for too little. (Ibn Jarir, Tirmidhi, Musnad, Abu Yala). In another tradition Ali says: This is a verse of the Quran which no one acted upon except me. As soon as it was enjoined, I offered the charity and consulted the Prophet about a problem. (Ibn Jarir, Hakim, Ibn al-Mundhi, Abd bin Humaid).

ءَاَشْفَقْتُمْ اَنْ تُقَدِّمُوْا بَيْنَ يَدَيْ نَجْوٰىكُمْ صَدَقٰتٍ ؕ فَاِذْ لَمْ تَفْعَلُوْا وَ تَابَ اللّٰ
عَلَيْكُمْ فَاَقِيْمُوا الصَّلٰوةَ وَ اٰتُوا الزَّكٰوةَ وَ اَطِيْعُوا اللّٰهَ وَ رَسُوْلَهٗ ؕ وَ اللّٰهُ خَبِيْرٌۢ بِمَا تَعْمَلُوْنَ ﴿۱۳﴾

(58:13) Are you afraid that you will have to offer charity when you hold private conversation with the Prophet? But

if you are unable to do so and Allah pardons you, then establish Prayer and pay Zakah, and obey Allah and His Messenger. Allah is well aware of all that you do. (30)

(30) This second command was sent down some time after the first command, and it concealed the injunction of giving something in charity. However, there is a difference of opinion as to how long the injunction remained in force. Qatadah says it remained in force for less than a day and then was abrogated. Muqatil bin Hayyan says that it remained in force for ten days; and this is the longest period of its life mentioned in any tradition.

اَلَمۡ تَرَ اِلَى الَّذِيۡنَ تَوَلَّوۡا قَوۡمًا غَضِبَ اللّٰهُ عَلَيۡهِمۡ ؕ مَّا هُمۡ مِّنۡكُمۡ وَ لَا مِنۡهُمۡ ۙ وَ يَحۡلِفُوۡنَ عَلَى الۡكَذِبِ وَ هُمۡ يَعۡلَمُوۡنَ ۝١٤

(58:14) Do you not see those who took for friends a people whom Allah is wroth with? (31) They neither belong to you nor you to them. (32) They swear to a falsehood, and they do so knowingly. (33)

(31) The allusion is to the Jews of Al-Madinah whom the hypocrites had taken for friends.

(32) That is, they are neither sincere in their connections with the believers, nor with the Jews: their relations with both are based on selfish interests.

(33) A false oath: that they have believed in and have accepted Muhammad (peace be upon him) as their guide and leader and are faithful to Islam and the Muslims.

اَعَدَّ اللّٰهُ لَهُمۡ عَذَابًا شَدِيۡدًا ؕ اِنَّهُمۡ سَآءَ مَا كَانُوۡا يَعۡمَلُوۡنَ ۝١٥

(58:15) Allah has prepared for them a grievous chastisement. Indeed, evil are the acts in which they are engaged.

اِتَّخَذُوۡۤا اَيۡمَانَهُمۡ جُنَّةً فَصَدُّوۡا عَنۡ سَبِيۡلِ اللّٰهِ فَلَهُمۡ عَذَابٌ مُّهِيۡنٌ ۝١٦

(58:16) They have taken their oaths as a shield by means of which they hinder people from the Way of Allah. (34) Theirs shall be a humiliating chastisement.

(34) That is, on the one hand, they swear oaths to their faith and fidelity to make the Muslims believe that they belong to them, and on the other, they sow doubts and suspicions against Islam and the followers of Islam and the Prophet (peace be upon him) of Islam in the hearts of the people, so that they should turn away from Islam in disgust taking their word to be a true inside picture of Islam, coming from the Muslims themselves.

لَن تُغْنِيَ عَنْهُمْ أَمْوَٰلُهُمْ وَلَآ أَوْلَٰدُهُم مِّنَ ٱللَّهِ شَيْـًٔا ۖ أُو۟لَٰٓئِكَ أَصْحَٰبُ ٱلنَّارِ ۖ هُمْ فِيهَا خَٰلِدُونَ ﴿١٧﴾

(58:17) Neither their possessions nor their offspring will be of any avail to them against Allah. They are the people of the Fire; therein they shall abide.

يَوْمَ يَبْعَثُهُمُ ٱللَّهُ جَمِيعًا فَيَحْلِفُونَ لَهُۥ كَمَا يَحْلِفُونَ لَكُمْ وَيَحْسَبُونَ أَنَّهُمْ عَلَىٰ شَىْءٍ ۚ أَلَآ إِنَّهُمْ هُمُ ٱلْكَٰذِبُونَ ﴿١٨﴾

(58:18) On the Day when Allah will raise them all from the dead they will swear before Him as they swear before you today, (35) thinking that this will avail them. Behold, they are utter liars.

(35) That is, not being content with swearing oaths before the people in this world, they will swear false oaths also before Allah Himself in the Hereafter, for falsehood and fraud has become second nature with them, which they will not give up even after death.

ٱسْتَحْوَذَ عَلَيْهِمُ ٱلشَّيْطَٰنُ فَأَنسَىٰهُمْ ذِكْرَ ٱللَّهِ ۚ أُو۟لَٰٓئِكَ حِزْبُ ٱلشَّيْطَٰنِ ۚ أَلَآ إِنَّ حِزْبَ ٱلشَّيْطَٰنِ هُمُ ٱلْخَٰسِرُونَ ﴿١٩﴾

(58:19) Satan has gained mastery over them and has made them neglect remembering Allah. They are the party of Satan. Behold, the party of Satan will be the losers.

اِنَّ الَّذِیۡنَ یُحَآدُّوۡنَ اللّٰہَ وَ رَسُوۡلَہٗۤ اُولٰٓئِکَ فِی الۡاَذَلِّیۡنَ ﴿۲۰﴾

(58:20) Verily those who oppose Allah and His Messenger will be among the most abject beings.

کَتَبَ اللّٰہُ لَاَغۡلِبَنَّ اَنَا وَ رُسُلِیۡ ؕ اِنَّ اللّٰہَ قَوِیٌّ عَزِیۡزٌ ﴿۲۱﴾

(58:21) Allah has written: “Surely I will prevail; I and My Messengers.” (36) Verily Allah is Most Strong, Most Mighty.

(36) For explanation, see (E.N. 93 of Surah As-Safat).

لَا تَجِدُ قَوۡمًا یُّؤۡمِنُوۡنَ بِاللّٰہِ وَ الۡیَوۡمِ الۡاٰخِرِ یُوَآدُّوۡنَ مَنۡ حَآدَّ اللّٰہَ وَ رَسُوۡلَہٗ وَ لَوۡ کَانُوۡۤا اٰبَآءَہُمۡ اَوۡ اَبۡنَآءَہُمۡ اَوۡ اِخۡوَانَہُمۡ اَوۡ عَشِیۡرَتَہُمۡ ؕ اُولٰٓئِکَ کَتَبَ فِیۡ قُلُوۡبِہِمُ الۡاِیۡمَانَ وَ اَیَّدَہُمۡ بِرُوۡحٍ مِّنۡہُ ؕ وَ یُدۡخِلُہُمۡ جَنّٰتٍ تَجۡرِیۡ مِنۡ تَحۡتِہَا الۡاَنۡہٰرُ خٰلِدِیۡنَ فِیۡہَا ؕ رَضِیَ اللّٰہُ عَنۡہُمۡ وَ رَضُوۡا عَنۡہُ ؕ اُولٰٓئِکَ حِزۡبُ اللّٰہِ ؕ اَلَاۤ اِنَّ حِزۡبَ اللّٰہِ ہُمُ الۡمُفۡلِحُوۡنَ ﴿۲۲﴾

(58:22) You shall not find a people who believe in Allah and the Last Day befriending those who oppose Allah and His Messenger even though they be their fathers or their sons or their brothers or their kindred. (37) He has inscribed faith in their hearts and has strengthened them with a spirit from Him, and He shall make them enter Gardens beneath which rivers flow. Therein they shall abide. Allah is well-pleased with them, and they are well-pleased with Him. They belong to Allah's party. Verily Allah's party shall prosper.

(37) Two things have been stated in this verse: first, a matter of principle, and the second, a statement of fact. The matter of principle is that faith in the true religion and love of the opponents of the religion are contradictory things, which cannot conceivably co-exist in one and the same place. It is absolutely impossible that love of the faith and love of the enemies of Allah and His Messenger (peace be upon him) should co-exist in one and the same heart, just as a person’s love for himself and his love for his enemy cannot co-exist in his heart simultaneously This is as if to say: lf you see a person who professes the faith as well as keeps relations of love with the opponents of Islam, you should never be involved in the misunderstanding that he might

perhaps be true in his profession in spite of his this attitude and conduct. Likewise, the people who have established relations with Islam and the opponents of Islam simultaneously, should themselves also consider their position well and see what they actually are. Are they believers or hypocrites? And what actually they want to be. Do they want to live as believers or as hypocrites? If they have any righteousness left in them and any feeling that from a moral viewpoint hypocrisy is the meanest and most abject attitude for man, they should give up their attempt to ride in two boats simultaneously. Faith wants them to be decisive. If they want to remain believers, they should sever and sacrifice all those connections that clash with their relationship with Islam. If they hold another relation dearer to themselves than the relationship with Islam, then they should better give up their false profession of Islam.

Here, Allah has not just stated the principle but has also presented the fact as a model before those who professed the faith. The true believers had in fact severed all connections that clashed with their relationship with Allah’s religion. This had been witnessed by entire Arabia in the battles of Badr and Uhud. The emigrants from Makkah had fought against their own tribe and closest kinsmen only for the sake of Allah and His religion. Abu Ubaidah killed his father, Abdullah bin al-jarrah. Musab bin Umair killed his brother, Ubaid bin Umair. Umar killed his maternal uncle, Aas bin Hisham bin Mughirah. Abu Bakr became ready to fight his son, Abdur Rahman. Ali, Hamzah and Ubaidah bin al-Harith killed Utbah, Shaibah and Walid bin Utbah, who were their close kinsmen. About the prisoners of war captured at Badr, Umar gave the opinion that they should all be put to the sword, and proposed that a relative should kill a relative. In the same battle of Badr when Musab bin Umair saw that an Ansari Muslim had captured his real brother, Abu Aziz bin Umair, and was tying him, he shouted out to him, saying: Tie him tight: his mother is a rich woman. She will pay you a large ransom. Abu Aziz said: You are a brother and say this. Musab replied: Not you, but this Ansari Muslim is my brother now who has captured you. In the same battle of Badr, Abul Aas the son-in-law of the Prophet (peace be upon him) was taken as a prisoner and was shown no special

favor any different from the other prisoners on account of his relationship with the Prophet (peace be upon him). Thus, the world was made a witness to the fact and shown the character of the sincere Muslims and their profound relationship with Allah and His Messenger (peace be upon him).

Dailami has related this invocation of the Prophet (peace be upon him) on the authority of Muadh: Alla-humma la taj al li-fajir-in (and according to another tradition, il-fasiq-in) alayya yadan wa la ni mata fa yuwadda-hu qalbi fa-inni wajad-tu fima uhitu ilayya la tajidu qaum-an yu minuna billahi wal-yaum il-akhir-i yuwaaddiuaa man haadd-Allahs wa Rasulahu: O God, let not the wicked (and according to another tradition, the sinful) do me a favor because of which I may have love for him in my heart, for in the revelation sent down by You, I have also found this: You will never find any people who believe in Allah and the Last Day loving those who oppose Allah and His Messenger (peace be upon